

## REMARKS

Claims 130-133 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims 130-132 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

### ***Rejection of Claims 130-133 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claims 130-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ruppert et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,640,002. This rejection is traversed.

Independent claims 130-132 require, *inter alia*, inserting the data into digital data comprising at least one of an image data content file, a video data content file and an audio data content file for subsequent authentication of the digital data. Further, independent claim 133 requires inserting data into a digital image for subsequent authentication of the digital image.

Ruppert discloses a portable radio frequency ID tag and bar-code reader used for example, at a supermarket checkout stand to authenticate articles by accessing a factory computer using the serial number of the article scanned from a radio frequency ID tag on the article. Ruppert discloses that a computer sends its public key to a factory host computer (Ruppert, Figure 41, Reference Numeral 749); and that the factory computer uses its secret key to authenticate a serial number list, generates an authentication message, generates authentication signature of the message, and encrypts the authentication signature and authentication signature message using the public key (Ruppert, Figure 41, Reference Numerals 753-759).

Ruppert does not disclose or suggest digital data comprising at least one of an image data content file, a video data content file and an audio data content file, as *inter alia* required by independent claims 130-132.

Also, Ruppert does not disclose or suggest inserting the received data comprising a public key for a digital signature into a predetermined bits portion of the digital data, as *inter alia* required by independent claims 130-132. First, Ruppert does not disclose or suggest a predetermined bits portion of digital data into which received data are inserted. That is, Ruppert does not disclose or suggest digital data comprising a predetermined bits portion into which some other data for authentication are inserted.

Further, since Ruppert does not disclose or suggest this feature, Ruppert is incapable of disclosing or suggesting inserting received data comprising a public key for a digital signature into the predetermined its portion of the digital data, as further required by independent claims 130-132.

Moreover, Ruppert does not disclose or suggest inserting the received data comprising a public key for a digital signature into a predetermined bits portion of the digital image, as *inter alia* required by independent claim 133. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

### ***Rejection of Claims 130-133 under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 130-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Muratani et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,061,451 in view of Ruppert. This rejection is traversed.

Muratani does not disclose or suggest a digital signature inserted into the digital data, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims 130-133. Further, since Muratani does not disclose or suggest inserting a digital signature, Muratani is

incapable of disclosing or suggesting inserting a public key for the digital signature, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims 130-133.

Further, Muratani does not disclose or suggest inserting a public key for a digital signature into a predetermined bits portion of the digital data, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims by 130-134. Therefore, Muratani does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims by 130-134. Ruppert, as discussed in the traversal of the § 102 rejection, does not cure the deficiencies of Muratani as they relate to independent claims 130-133. Therefore, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Application believes that the Application is now allowable and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

  
George Brieger  
Registration No. 52,652

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343, Ext. 503

GB/ns